

REMARKS

The present Amendment is in response to the Examiner's Office Action mailed May 14, 2008. Claims 13-17, 20-23, 27, and 34 are canceled, claims 7, 18, 24, and 30 are amended, and claims 35-41 are added. Claims 7-12, 18-19, 24-26, 28-33, and 35-41 are now pending in view of the above amendments.

Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested in view of the above amendments to the claims and the following remarks. For the Examiner's convenience and reference, Applicant's remarks are presented in the order in which the corresponding issues were raised in the Office Action.

Please note that the following remarks are not intended to be an exhaustive enumeration of the distinctions between any cited references and the claims. Rather, the distinctions identified and discussed below are presented solely by way of example to illustrate some of the differences between the claims and the cited references. In addition, Applicant requests that the Examiner carefully review any references discussed below to ensure that Applicant's understanding and discussion of the references, if any, is consistent with the Examiner's understanding.

I. Allowed Subject Matter

The Examiner's allowance of claims 7-12, 18 and 19 is appreciated. Applicant wishes to thank the Examiner for the careful review and allowance of these claims.

The Applicant submits the following comments concerning the Examiner's statements of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter in the Office Action. Applicant agrees with the Examiner that claims 7-12, 18 and 19 are patentable over the prior art, but respectfully disagrees with the Examiner's statement of reasons for allowance as set forth in Office Action. Applicant submits that it is the claim as a whole, rather than any particular element, that makes each of the claims allowable. No single element should be construed as the reason for allowance of a claim because it is each of the elements of the claim that makes it allowable. Therefore, Applicant does not concede that the reasons for allowable subject matter given by the Examiner are the only reasons that make, or would make, the claims allowable and do not make any admission or concession concerning the Examiner's statement in the Office Action. Applicant further asserts that claims 7 and 18 as currently amended distinguish over the art of record.

Claims 14, 16, 27, 29, 34 are objected to as being dependent on a rejected base claim but will be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the elements of the base claim and any intervening claims. Claims 14 and 16 have been canceled rendering the objection moot. Applicant has rewritten claim 24 to include the elements of claim 27, and claim 30 to include the elements of claim 34. In particular, the scope of claims 24, and 30 have not been narrowed in any way so as to overcome any prior art, but have merely been rewritten in an independent format. Claim 24 has also been amended to replace reference to first and second buttons with "first and second inputs."

As acknowledged by the Examiner, these claims are patentably distinct from the prior art, and are now in a condition for allowance. Moreover, for at least the same reason, claims now depending from claims 24 and 30, namely claims 25-26, 28-29, and 31-33, are also in a condition for allowance.

In summary, claims 7-12, 18-19, 24-26, and 28-33 are all patentably distinct from the prior art. Allowance of each of these claims is respectfully requested.

II. PRIOR ART REJECTIONS

A. Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §102(a)

The Examiner rejected claims 13, 15, 17, 20, 22-24, 28, 30, and 31 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) over *Hu et al.* (United States Patent No. 6,104,510). Applicant respectfully asserts that claims 13, 15, 17, 20, 22-24, 28, 30, and 31 are neither anticipated nor rendered obvious by *Hu et al.* However, in order to expedite claims directed to subject matter found allowable by the Examiner, claims 13, 15, 17, and 20-23 have been canceled and claims 24 and 30 have been amended to incorporate subject matter found allowable by the Examiner. Claims 28 and 31 are dependent on allowable claims 24 and 30, respectively, and are therefore allowable. The rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) is therefore moot.

B. Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

The Examiner rejects claims 25, 26, 32, and 33 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 over *Hu et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6,104,510) in view of well known art. Applicant respectfully asserts that claims 25, 26, 32, and 33 are neither anticipated nor rendered obvious by *Hu et al.* However, in order to expedite claims directed to subject matter found allowable by the Examiner, independent claims 24 and 30, upon which claims 25, 26, 32, and 33 depend, have been amended to incorporate

subject matter found allowable by the Examiner. The rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103 is therefore moot.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicant believes the claims as amended are in allowable form. In the event that the Examiner finds remaining impediment to a prompt allowance of this application that may be clarified through a telephone interview, or which may be overcome by an Examiner's Amendment, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned attorney.

Dated this 14th day of August, 2008.

Respectfully submitted,

/R. Burns Israelsen/ Reg. No. 42685

R. BURNS ISRAELSEN
Registration No. 42,685
Attorney for Applicant
Customer No. 022913
Telephone: (801) 533-9800

C:\NrPortbl\DMS1\MPATE\1784165_1.DOC